



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/684,595

10/05/2000

Paul Haeberli

11087-017001

2363

31688

7590

02/25/2005

TRAN & ASSOCIATES  
6768 MEADOW VISTA CT.  
SAN JOSE, CA 95135

EXAMINER

YANG, RYAN R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2672

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/684,595

Applicant(s)

HAEBERLI, PAUL

Examiner

Ryan R Yang

Art Unit

2672

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: Response, filed on 8/12/2004.

This action is non-final.

2. Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 12, 16 and 17 are independent claims.

3. The present title of the invention is "Previewing a framed image print" as filed originally.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5. Claims 1-9, 11-15, 17-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oles (6,047,130) in view of Kato et al. (5,369,736), and further in view Dawson et al. (5,179,638).

As per claim 1, Oles discloses a method of generating a frame prototype image showing a picture image framed within a frame, the method comprising:

providing a frame image showing the frame in a perspective view, the frame image having a picture portion corresponding to the portion of the frame used to view a picture mounted in the frame (Figure 4 26); and

mapping the picture image to the picture portion of the frame image in order to generate the frame prototype image (Figure 3 24 to Figure 4 24).

Oles discloses a method of generating a frame prototype image. It is noted that Oles does not explicitly disclose "modifying a texture value at a pixel by the original pixel

Art Unit: 2672

value of the picture image to generate the frame prototype image", however, this is known in the art as taught by Kato et al. hereinafter Kato. Kato discloses the frame prototype image is generated from the original picture (the design simulation is carried out by photographing or taking the picture of the interior of the automobile and then modifying the texture of a seat part in the photographed picture image, column 2, line 43-46).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Kato into Oles because Oles discloses a method of generating a frame prototype image and Kato discloses a frame prototype image can be modified in order to assist design simulation.

Oles and Kato disclose a method of generating a frame prototype image. It is noted that Oles and Kato do not explicitly disclose using texture mapping the picture image of the frame image to generate the frame prototype image, however, this is known in the art as taught by Dawson et al., hereinafter Dawson. Dawson discloses a method of providing a texture mapped perspective view for digital map systems (column 2, line 61-62, since the digital map is a prototype image).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Dawson into Oles and Kato because Oles and Kato disclose a method of generating a prototype image and Dawson discloses the image texture can be texture mapped in perspective in order to enhance visual reality (column 1, line 50).

6. As per claim 2, Oles, Kato and Dawson demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected independent claim 1, supra, and Oles further discloses identifying a picture portion of the frame image (Figure 3 24).

7. As per claim 3, Oles, Kato and Dawson demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected dependent claim 2, supra, and Oles further discloses identifying the picture portion of the frame image includes providing a mat identifying the picture portion of the frame image (Figure 3 24).

8. As per claim 4, Oles, Kato and Dawson demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected dependent claim 3, supra, and Oles further discloses the mat includes a plurality of pixels, each pixel having a pixel value (since the display device is a computer display, it is inherent that the image is represented by a plurality of pixels).

9. As per claim 5, Oles, Kato and Dawson demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected dependent claim 4, supra, and Oles further discloses wherein identifying the picture portion of the frame image includes setting each pixel in the mat that corresponds to the picture portion of the frame image to a first pixel value (since pixels values are used to represent a picture, the pixels are at certain values at any time).

10. As per claim 6, Oles, Kato and Dawson demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected dependent claim 2, supra, and Oles further discloses wherein identifying the picture portion of the frame image includes identifying the outer perimeter of the picture portion of the frame image (Figure 2 when a picture is selected, its picture and frame are identified).

11. As per claim 7, Oles, Kato and Dawson demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected independent claim 1, supra, and Oles further discloses wherein the picture portion of the frame image has a quadrilateral shape and the method further includes identifying the picture portion of the frame image including identifying the four comers of the picture portion (Figure 2 shows the picture is quadrilateral shape and since the picture is movable, its four corners are indentified).

12. As per claim 8, Oles, Kato and Dawson demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected independent claim 1, supra, and Oles further discloses displaying the frame prototype image (Figure 4 26).

13. As per claim 9, Oles, Kato and Dawson demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected independent claim 1, supra.

Oles and Dawson disclose a method of generating a in perspective frame prototype image, it is noted that Oles and Dawson do not explicitly disclose "mapping the picture image to the picture portion of the frame image includes texture mapping the picture image to the picture portion of the frame image", however, Since both the frame image texture and picture image texture are both image texture, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to map frame prototype image texture to perspective frame prototype image texture and picture prototype image texture to perspective picture image texture in order to perform proper transformation.

14. As per claim 11, Oles, Kato and Dawson demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected independent claim 1, supra, and Oles further discloses the frame

image is captured using a digital camera (Figure 1 50 the CCD connected to 54 the computer).

15. As per claim 12, Oles discloses a computer program product tangibly embodied in a computer-readable medium, for generating a frame prototype image showing a picture image framed within a frame, comprising instructions operable to cause a computer to:

receive the picture image (Figure 1 50 to 54);

store a frame image showing the frame in a perspective view and a mat identifying the picture portion of the frame image (Figure 4 26; since Figure 1 54 is a computer, it can store image); and

map the picture image to the picture portion of the frame image in order to generate the frame prototype image (Figure 4 26 to Figure 5 26).

Oles discloses a method of generating a frame prototype image. It is noted that Oles does not explicitly disclose "modifying a texture value at a pixel by the original pixel value of the picture image to generate the frame prototype image", however, this is known in the art as taught by Kato et al. hereinafter Kato. Kato discloses the frame prototype image is generated from the original picture (the design simulation is carried out by photographing or taking the picture of the interior of the automobile and then modifying the texture of a seat part in the photographed picture image, column 2, line 43-46).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Kato into Oles because Oles

discloses a method of generating a frame prototype image and Kato discloses a frame prototype image can be modified in order to assist design simulation.

Oles and Kato disclose a method of generating a frame prototype image. It is noted that Oles and Kato do not explicitly disclose using texture mapping the picture image of the frame image to generate the frame prototype image, however, this is known in the art as taught by Dawson. Dawson discloses a method of providing a texture mapped perspective view for digital map systems (column 2, line 61-62, since the digital map is a prototype image).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Dawson into Oles and Kato because Oles and Kato disclose a method of generating a prototype image and Dawson discloses the image texture can be texture mapped in perspective in order to enhance visual reality (column 1, line 50).

16. As per claim 13, Oles, Kato and Dawson demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected independent claim 12, *supra*, and Oles further discloses instructions operable to cause the computer to generate the map (Figure 4 26 to Figure 5 26; since Figure 1 54 is a computer, it can contain instructions to generate the map).

17. As per claim 14, Oles, Kato and Dawson demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected dependent claim 13, *supra*, and Oles further discloses instructions operable to cause the computer to generate the map by identifying the picture portion of the frame image (Figure 4 24).



18. As per claim 15, Oles, Kato and Dawson demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected dependent claim 12, supra, and Oles further discloses instructions operable to cause the computer to identify the picture portion of the frame image by identifying the outer perimeter of the picture portion of the frame image (Figure 2 when a picture is selected, its picture and frame are identified).

19. As per claim 17, Oles discloses a method of generating a visual representation of an image based product, the method comprising:

providing an image to be included in the image based product (Figure 4);

providing a perspective image showing the image based product in a perspective view, the perspective image having a picture portion corresponding to the portion of the image based product used to view a picture mounted on the image based product (Figure 4 26 to Figure 5 26); and

mapping the image to the picture portion of the perspective image in order to generate the perspective prototype image (Figure 4 24 to Figure 5 24).

Oles discloses a method of generating a frame prototype image. It is noted that Oles does not explicitly disclose “modifying a texture value at a pixel by the original pixel value of the picture image to generate the frame prototype image”, however, this is known in the art as taught by Kato. Kato discloses the frame prototype image is generated from the original picture (the design simulation is carried out by photographing or taking the picture of the interior of the automobile and then modifying the texture of a seat part in the photographed picture image, column 2, line 43-46).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Kato into Oles because Oles discloses a method of generating a frame prototype image and Kato discloses a frame prototype image can be modified in order to assist design simulation.

Oles and Kato disclose a method of generating a frame prototype image. It is noted that Oles and Kato do not explicitly disclose using texture mapping the picture image of the frame image to generate the frame prototype image, however, this is known in the art as taught by Dawson. Dawson discloses a method of providing a texture mapped perspective view for digital map systems (column 2, line 61-62, since the digital map is a prototype image).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Dawson into Oles and Kato because Oles and Kato disclose a method of generating a prototype image and Dawson discloses the image texture can be texture mapped in perspective in order to enhance visual reality (column 1, line 50).

20. As per claim 18, Oles, Kato and Dawson demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected independent claim 17, supra, and Oles further discloses the image based product is a framed picture (Figure 4 24).

21. As per claim 19, Oles, Kato and Dawson demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected independent claim 17, supra, and Oles further discloses the image based product is a Photocard (since the image is a photo image).

22. As per claim 21, Oles, Kato and Dawson demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected dependent claim 20, supra, and Oles further discloses the method includes displaying the perspective image in an environment that provides a context for viewing the image based product (Figure 4).

23. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oles (6,047,130), Kato and Dawson as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kurashige (5,282,262).

As per claim 10, Oles, Kato and Dawson demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected independent claim 1, supra.

Oles, Kato and Dawson disclose a system of generating a frame prototype image. It is noted that Oles, Kato and Dawson do not explicitly disclose "mapping the picture image to the picture portion of the frame image includes mapping the picture image to the picture portion of the frame image using the illumination of the picture portion of the frame image", however, this is known in the art as taught by Kurashige. Kurashige discloses a method of transforming a two-dimensional image by illumination on a three-surface (Figure 4A-4B).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Kurashige into Oles, Kato and Dawson because Oles, Kato and Dawson disclose a system of generating a frame prototype image and Kurashige discloses mapping an image into an illuminated region in order to make the image more realistic.

24. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oberg (5,870,771) in view of Oles (6,047,130), and further in view of Dawson et al. (5,179,638).

As per claim 16, Oberg discloses a system for generating a frame prototype image showing a picture image framed within a frame, the system comprising:

a client computer in communication with a computer network (Figure 3 70);

a server, in communication with a computer network, having server software embodied in a computer-readable medium, the server software comprising instructions operable to cause the server to:

receive the picture image from the client computer (Figure 3 72);

wherein the client computer includes client software embodied in a computer readable medium, the client software comprising instructions operable to cause the client computer to upload the picture image to the server ("a customer can input a digital image of an object to be framed to the system through a digital camera 32", column 5, line 64-66. Thus, it is inherent that the digital camera has the desired software to upload the picture image to the server).

Oberg discloses a system of generating a frame prototype image. It is noted that Oberg does not explicitly disclose "store a frame image showing the frame in a perspective view and a mat identifying the picture portion of the frame image; and map the picture image to the picture portion of the frame image in order to generate the frame prototype image", however, this is known in the art as taught by Oles. Oles discloses a computer to generating a portrait photograph in which a frame and the

picture in it are transformed into perspective view (Figure 4 24 and 26 to Figure 5 24 and 26).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Oles into Oberg because Oberg discloses a system of generating a frame prototype image and Oles discloses a method of putting the picture in perspective in order to visually determine the appropriate size of a portrait photograph (column 2, line 4).

Oberg and Oles disclose a method of generating a frame prototype image. It is further noted that Oberg and Oles do not explicitly disclose using texture mapping to map the picture image, however, this is known in the art as taught by Dawson. Dawson discloses a method of providing a texture mapped perspective view for digital map systems, column 2, line 61-62.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Dawson into Oberg and Oles because Oberg and Oles discloses a method of generating a prototype image and Dawson discloses the image can be texture mapped in perspective in order to enhance visual reality (column 1, line 50).

25. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oles, Kato and Dawson et al. as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Oberg.

Oles, Kato and Dawson disclose a computer to generating a frame prototype image in perspective. It is noted that Oles, Kato and Dawson do not explicitly disclose the image based product is a photo greeting card, however, this is known in the art as

taught by Oberg. Oberg discloses a system to generating a portrait photograph which is a photo greeting card.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Oberg into Oles, Kato and Dawson because Oles, Kato and Dawson disclose a system of generating an image in perspective and Oberg discloses the image can be made into a portrait photograph in order to make immediate use (column 2, line 4).

### ***Response to Arguments***

26. Applicant's arguments, see Response, filed 8/12/2004, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-15 and 17-21 under Oles and Dawson have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Oles, Kato and Dawson.

Applicant also alleges Oles only use "size perspective" for video image, therefore, Oles does not meet claims 1, 12, 16 and 17 "perspective" limitations. In reply, examiner note since applicant admits "size perspective" is a form of perspective, it meets the claim limitation. However, examiner further consider the disclosure "The present invention as depicted in Fig. 5 allows the customer or operator to change the perspective of the video image (and the size of the resulting portrait) as well as move and position the combined image within the simulated room setting image" (column 5, line 30-35). Since Oles specifically points out "(and the size of the resulting) as well as move and position the combined image" are additional conditions of perspective view

Art Unit: 2672

and since the two variables (size and position) are the only variable allowed to change in a head-on view image, Oles implies a perspective image means more than a head-on view. Therefore, a perspective view includes angle view.

As per claim 16, the argued limitation is not in the claim.

***Inquiries***

27. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan R Yang whose telephone number is (703) 308-6133. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30AM-6:00PM .

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi can be reached on (703) 305-4713. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Ryan Yang  
February 22, 2005